

Remarks

1. Claim Status

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-12, 14-23, 25-28, and 30-34, 36-37, 39-40, 44-48 remain pending. Claims 1, 12, 23, 28, and 33 are independent.

2. Prior Art Rejections

a. Claim 23

The final rejection of claim 23 states Pang (6,366,117) teaches “commands executed by one of multiple encryption units implementing different respective encryption algorithms” where the different encryption units comprise an AES engine and a DES engine. While Pang does list different encryption algorithms known in the prior art (col. 1, lines 31-44), the final action does not identify what in Pang is equated with the AES engine and the DES engine, nor does the Attorney for Applicant understand Pang to teach an AES engine and a DES engine co-existing in the FPGA of Pang. In other words, Pang’s acknowledgement that different encryption algorithms exist does not constitute a teaching of multiple encryption units implementing different encryption algorithms in Pang.

Applicant, thus, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 and its corresponding dependent claims. Applicant similarly requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 33 and its corresponding dependent claims.

b. Claim 1

The final rejection of claim 1 states that Kusakabe (6,073,236) “teaches at least some of the descriptors comprise commands executed by one of multiple encryption units implementing different respective encryption algorithms”. The final office action identifies “encryption section 12” and “decryption section 13” as the recited encryption units. The Examiner, thus, is using an interpretation of the term encryption to encompass both encryption and decryption. However, using this interpretation of “encryption algorithm” to encompass both encryption and decryption, Applicant disagrees that the “encryption section 12” and “decryption section 13” implement different respective encryption algorithms. Presumably, both the encryption section and encryption section will implement the same “encryption algorithm” (e.g., AES) not different ones. Applicant, thus, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Applicant, thus, requests withdrawal of claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims. Applicant similarly requests withdrawal of the rejections of claim 12 and 28 and their corresponding dependent claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/11/08

/Robert A. Greenberg/

Robert A. Greenberg
Reg. No. 44,133
Attorney for Intel® Americas

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778